DOCUMENT RESUME

EM 007 142

ED 027 746

Television in Language Arts Education. A National Instructional Television Report.
National Instructional Television Center, Bloomington, Ind.
Pub Date [68]
Note-12p.
Available from-N.I.T., The National Instructional Television Center, Box A, Bloomington, Ind. 47401
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.70
Descriptors-*Educational Television, *Instructional Television, *Language Arts, Language Skills, Production Techniques, Television Curriculum, Television Surveys, Video Tape Recordings
Identifiers-National Instructional Television, *N.I.T.

One of the conferences sponsored by National Instructional Television in 1968 was conducted to evaluate television materials being offered in Language Arts Education in order to stimulate effective television programing. Twelve specialists assessed materials collected from instructional television agencies across the country. They concluded that television instruction is generally inadequate. It does not enhance and is often a poor substitute for the teacher. Programs rarely achieve their intended objective. The lessons are conventional and tedious. Despite the present inadequacy of television instruction in Language Arts the assessors considered the media to be a potentially powerful teaching tool and they made recommendations as to how its potential can be realized. At present, of the 124 telecourses in use, 74 percent are for use in elementary grades. Most courses are recorded. The last section of the report gives a list of the telecourses with their title, producer, grade level, and the number, length, and frequency of broadcast. (RP)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A

National Instructional Television

Report

TELEVISION IN LANGUAGE ARTS EDUCATION

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	3
Part I — An Overview	4
Part II — The Status of Television in Language Arts Education	8
Part III — Television in Language Arts Education	9

This is one in a series of reports that consider the role of instructional television in specific disciplines. These reports are intended for those engaged in instructional television, for the educational community, and for colleges and universities with faculties that must be aware of developments in instructional television.

Also available from National Instructional Television are similar reports that consider the role of television in art, foreign language, music, mathematics, science, social studies and health and physical education.

N.I.T. is the central source of instructional television materials and information about instructional television in the United States. To relate its activities to the major needs of American education, N.I.T. works closely with content specialists, administrators, professional groups and television organizations representing local, state and regional activities.

N.I.T.
The National Instructional Television Center
Box A
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

This report concerns National Instructional Television's evaluation of television in Language Arts education. The conference was conducted in 1968 to assess television materials being offered in Language Arts education in an effort to stimulate the development of increasingly effective television programing. This report is divided into three sections:

- *Part I is an overview of the discussion of the Language Arts and television specialists who participated in the conference.*

- *Part II is a quantitative analysis of the telecourses in Language Arts education gathered for the assessment.*

- *Part III is a tabular breakdown of the information gathered. The materials listed in this section form the basis for Part II. The courses are categorized into primary, intermediate, secondary and in-service education.*

The conference participants viewed sample lessons from most of the telecourses listed in Part III and reviewed support materials which accompanied the lessons. During the final session the participants considered the role of television in language arts education.

The specialists who assessed the television materials are A. J. Beeler, National Council of Teachers of English; M. Virginia Biggy, Concord, Massachusetts, Public Schools; Elizabeth Burgess, Board of Education, Nashville, Tennessee; Marie Dickinson, Los Angeles County Schools; Pearl Faulk, Tulsa, Oklahoma, Public Schools; Leo Fay, Indiana University; Evelyn Girardin, Baltimore, Maryland, City Schools; Adah Miner, University of Washington; Rhea Sikes, WQED, Pittsburgh; Ralph C. Staiger, International Reading Association; Ruth Strickland, Indiana University; and William Work, Speech Association of America.

Part I — An Overview

The National Instructional Television Center's examination of television materials in elementary and secondary Language Arts education was to (1) assess the adequacy of existing materials and (2) to identify preliminary guidelines for the development of more effective materials for instruction.

Twelve persons with wide experience in the various aspects of the Language Arts and representing public schools, universities and professional associations constituted the panel of "assessors." The group included speech specialists, a noted researcher in the language arts, directors of elementary education and of curriculum, executive secretaries of two major professional associations — one in reading and one in speech, the president-elect of the International Reading Association, a specialist in instructional television and a school administrator.

Materials presented for "assessing" were collected from instructional television agencies across the country. Some of these are community television stations with specific instructional television departments which work closely with school districts that subscribe to the television service. Some are university educational television stations and some are closed-circuit organizations within given school systems. Every section of the country was represented and the materials which were screened ranged from early childhood programs through elementary and secondary student programs to teacher education programs.

Whenever there was a teacher's manual, a guide or a student handbook prepared to accompany the television materials, they were made available so that the specialists might fully appreciate the detailed planning which went into the development of each series.

The panel considered 124 sample programs. Each panel member had a notebook in which there were separate sheets for each program. Each sheet provided information about the producing agency and its location, the age level for which the program was intended, information about whether the program being viewed was one of a series and if so what the title of the series was as well as the title of the isolated program. The length of the program was identified and the name of the teacher was usually given though the credits on the program itself also provided that information. Panel members were instructed that each program could be viewed fully or that a program could be stopped at any time when the group felt it had seen enough. Quite naturally, the first few programs were allowed to run from beginning to end while the viewers became accustomed to the type of programing and the varied formats and began assimilating a set of criteria against which they would evaluate the programs. It is important to note that no formal rating sheets were used. Nor were the panel members given a "briefing" on what to look for or what criteria to employ. Therefore, it was interesting and exciting to observe the rapidity with which a group of "specialists" in the Language Arts developed both individual and group criteria and were able to identify strengths and weaknesses in content as well as production even though many had no previous experience with television production.

THE ASSESSMENT

By the end of the first viewing session, which proved to be a shakedown for the group, the panel had obtained ample evidence of the quality of content, presentation and production. Thereafter, few programs were viewed in their entirety. Indeed, some programs were cut by request of the panel after three or four minutes. Others held some promise and were allowed to run close to the end so that panel members might assess the way in which the television teacher brought the lesson to a close.

The spontaneous evaluative comments about the program while it was being viewed as well as those made between the finish of one and the start of another helped the panel to identify the strengths and weaknesses with which each member was concerned. Most panel members recorded their evaluative comments on the information sheet for the particular program, thereby making their assessment of each program readily accessible during discussion about those programs which had the most or least merit.

The number of instructional television programs being produced identifies the fact that television is used as a tool of instruction in the Language Arts. Essentially, television is used as supplementary instruction, although some programs in phonics and in creative writing are referred to as basic instruction in accompanying guide materials.

Many more of the telecourses are directed toward elementary than secondary students. Though one of the stated goals of the programing may be to bring to the student that which his teacher does not, it appeared that the television product really

did not enhance and was often, in fact, a poor substitute for the teacher.

The programs the panel screened seemed to separate into the following categories: — story telling, vocabulary building, some grammar lessons, a few programs designed (but failing) to stimulate creative writing, some programs intended to increase reading ability, a few attempts at teaching skills such as report writing and outlining, some children's literature and some in-service programing.

In all but a few cases the programs never really accomplished what they claimed to have been designed and produced to do. The quality of instruction was poor and the obvious obsolescence of content and teaching techniques was disheartening. Many times in the course of the viewing, the panel members commented about the unfortunate choice of techniques for instruction. All too often, a not very good classroom lesson taught by a not very good teacher was recorded and preserved so far too many children could be exposed to content and instruction that was neither pertinent to their needs nor worth a fraction of the time and money spent in preparing the program.

The lessons tended to perpetuate a methodology (authoritarian and deductive) that overlooked the intellectual powers of children and youth and demanded little more than listening to remember and repetition of predetermined answers.

Most of the programs were much too long for what they offered. Frequently they were 30 minutes long when five or ten would have been sufficient to teach the content and to have at least as much time left for reinforcement. In most cases, the teacher talked down to the students and if the teacher had puppets as helpers they too talked down to the students. Often the approach to catch children's interest was an unnecessary gimmick or a contrived story in which puppets (or in some cases other students) attempted to act out the part of "Mr. Word-Watcher" or some other useless character. In all too many cases the approach was foolish and didn't become the conventional teacher who was teaching the conventional lesson or presenting conventional material — poorly! In other words, the "gimmicks" served no purpose. They would be insulting to all but the slowest of viewers and they did nothing to enhance the presentation of the content. The television production, except in the few rare programs, was stilted, unimaginative, often cluttered and poorly composed. Production mistakes that should have been overcome years ago seemed to be popping up again in some of the programing. The power of television as a medium of instruction was not realized in the collection of Language Arts programs available for viewing.

An even more serious concern arises from the viewing — What evaluation of the programing was made by the producing agencies that turned it out? They were requested to send samples representative of the quality of the total series. One wonders if they are aware of how seriously the programs missed the mark.

There was virtually nothing viewed which was designed to assist those students in disadvantaged or ghetto areas and there was little in the programs to help youngsters or teachers develop their own inter-personal communication proficiencies.

Particularly noticeable evidence that the medium is not being used effectively for Language Arts instruction was the failure to exploit television's potential for bringing resources — human and materials — into the classroom that could not otherwise be offered to the student or the teacher viewers.

There were no programs concerned with speech — giving speeches, improving speech, using speech in a variety of ways. The panel members remarked regularly that in many cases the speech used by the instructor on the program was really not very good either.

The selection of teaching personnel in the Language Arts is especially critical. The ability to communicate effectively with the audience is essential in all instructional television. The lack of it is particularly damaging in the Language Arts when the teacher's presentation contributes negatively to efforts to have the viewers become more effective receptors and generators of communication of various kinds.

There was no evidence that any program was developed using the knowledge which exists on how children learn language.

In an era when increasing recognition is being given to inductive teaching and discovery methods, the materials seemed to lack those elements that will encourage active involvement on the part of the viewers. Perhaps one of the most important implications of what was viewed was that the "Language Arts" are poorly defined and poorly articulated in terms of educational goals and objectives. The specification of behavioral objectives might help to provide better coordination and direction toward the development of better programing.

At the end of a day of viewing, it was a stunning blow to realize that in all the programs seen that day there was not even one that caused the panel of assessors to ask to have it viewed again. Worse still, there had not been more than three programs

which seemed to have considered new concepts of motivation, new techniques in instruction, new content in Language Arts or accomplishing within the program what the Guide claimed was going to take place. A single, kind, summary term for the programs offered for evaluation is "dull." They lacked that dynamic quality necessary to reach out and "grab" the viewer. They failed to communicate with the audience. And there were almost no examples of the excitement and fluidity of the language nor were there illustrations of the personal power one has over his own language.

At the close of the viewing sessions, one of the panel members commented, "If what we have seen is representative of the best instructional television programing in the Language Arts, the horizons for more and better materials are unlimited."

THE POTENTIAL OF TELEVISION

Does the fact that the panel of assessors was so disappointed by the quality of the collection of programs on the Language Arts now available mean that television is not a satisfactory means of instruction in the Language Arts? Not at all. The consensus was that it is a powerful teaching tool but that its potential has hardly been scratched. Perhaps this is because so few "specialists" in the Language Arts have had the opportunity to work closely in designing content and teaching techniques for programing. Or perhaps it is that the content specialist and the production specialist have not sat together long enough and often enough to understand one another's hopes and aspirations and to appreciate individual skills. Perhaps it is that schools have not demanded a quality product. Perhaps it is that those responsible for identifying the content for a series are really not attuned to what is new and exciting in the Language Arts. In this age of sophistication, the conference's hope is that none of these is the underlying reason for failing to capitalize on the power of television.

Seeking explanations for failure will serve no purpose. The important task is to get on with identifying the types of programing in the Language Arts that are necessary, pertinent and possible. In short, now what?

One full session of the three-day Conference on the Language Arts was set aside for the panel to discuss whether, indeed, there was a place for instruction via television in the Language Arts. If so, what guidelines should be established, what content should be considered, what teaching techniques should be used and for whom should the programing be developed?

This was the most exciting session of the conference. Every panel member participated eagerly and the disappointment and discouragement of the viewing seemed to fade into the background as everyone leaped into the discussion.

1. The moderator of the "think" session requested the specialists to discuss first the question of whether television ought to continue to be considered as a tool of instruction in the Language Arts.

Only one panel member raised a question concerning the value of instruction via television and he inquired if films, loops, filmstrips and books would not be equally good if not better instructional tools. Others quickly indicated that though each of the media he identified would serve certain purposes, they were committed to the idea that television was a very valuable method of instruction in the Language Arts.

2. The second question which the panel was asked to consider was concerned with suggestions for content and technique for programing for students.

Not one panel member suggested specific content. This is particularly significant because it illustrates so well that the era of "things" in Language Arts instruction has been replaced by a concern for concepts, attitudes and discovery of the power of language. No specific reference was made to grade level either which reinforces the concern for development of power in all phases of language instead of attention to isolated campaigns on "grammar," "report writing," etc. The panel's desire for broadly conceived programing does not in any way hint at a lack of concern with the development of language skills. Each panel member, at one time or another, acknowledged the importance of sequential development of skills in every aspect of the Language Arts.

The comments made to serve as guidelines for the design of student programing can be appreciated best if reported as single statements.

- The Language Arts like mathematics and science call for inductive methods, alternative ways of thinking and tolerance for a range of acceptable answers or language behaviors.
- Programs should be built on behavioral goals for learners. There should be programs that offer children a chance to think, to respond, to get involved in the learning act; programs that provide for flights of fancy, for sharpened imagery, for clarity of expression, for expanded skills and artistry in the use of language; programs that above all recognize the unique human function of language and deal honestly and directly with the vital problems of verbal interaction.
- Students should be exposed to a total approach to language — not a fragmented approach.

- Television opens doors for children.
- Data must be provided for children to think about language. Opportunities must be provided for children to gather and organize the data for new language information.
- The viewer must be involved.
- The program content must have relevance to the lives of the viewer.
- Short, "sparkling" programs will be of far more value than longer, duller programs.
- Whenever possible, the teacher should be off the screen.
- If a teacher is to be used, be certain he understands and practices the art of communication.
- A variety of teaching techniques must be introduced and used.
- Close attention must be given to research on motivation and on how children learn language.
- Pilot programs should be field tested to ascertain student reactions before completing any series.
- The technique of organizing and interpreting information should be illustrated and information provided for practice.
- Television's great power to teach listening skills should be used.
- Programing which provides experiences for children to develop skills in critical thinking and composition should be produced.
- Students should be helped to recognize the power they have to work with their own language, to appreciate its fluidity and yet to respect the need for precision in certain circumstances.
- Programing to assist junior and senior high school students to appreciate, understand and analyze literature should be developed.
- Students should be exposed to the philosophy, history and structure of their language.
- Students should be led to appreciate the value of clear speech and to develop useful speech patterns and habits.
- Differences in speech patterns and dialects in the United States can be stressed and the background of these patterns better understood.
- A responsibility to use language effectively must be developed.
- Students can be helped to understand and appreciate the integrity of language use in human relations.
- Students can be led to understand communication as human behavior, to analyze communication behavior and to develop the appreciation and acceptance of a much wider range of language.

The panel of assessors slowed down temporarily when one of the panel suggested that time be spent in group preparation of behavioral objectives in the Language Arts. A brief but unsuccessful attempt was made. Though panel members were in complete agreement that behavioral objectives must be developed as the core of any future programing, they were also mindful that such a task cannot be undertaken by twelve people in one morning however clear each one's image may be of the "ideal" sequence in Language Arts.

3. The third question which the moderator raised was, "If we were to begin today to prepare a series of television programs for use in 1971, what priority would you establish for the content?"

Hardly a moment had passed before the panel members in chorus identified the priority to be programing for teachers.

The rationale for such a suggestion rests in the fact that Language Arts instruction, nationwide and at every level, is considerably behind what research and current thought identified by the specialists in Language Arts suggest as content. The lag between research and practice even in 1968 is far greater than ought to be tolerated. Language Arts instruction must be stepped up to be in tune with the uses of language which surround students. To do this as rapidly as possible means that teachers must be given intensive training. More important they must be given ample opportunity to understand the fluidity of their language, to view model teachers presenting model lessons and to appreciate the necessity to integrate the Language Arts in all instruction. Those faculty members who view themselves as appointed by the Lord to guard the language in a pure and "as it used to be" context need to be put at ease and reassured that exciting new developments in the use of language — not to mention in the teaching of Language Arts — will greatly enhance the language rather than signal the end of the world.

If in-service programing for teachers is to be given priority, the material might review for teachers what research is saying about how children learn language and then suggest what implications that research has for instructional techniques in the Language Arts.

Another concern with in-service training work is the audience for which one ought to prepare programing. *For Example, Teachers of 20 Years Experience May Well Require One Kind of Information Which Those of Three and Four Years of Experience do not Need.* Yet the relatively new mem-

bers of the profession also need some updating. Preparation of television programing for preservice teachers would be helpful and should be considered. However, it is unlikely that it could claim the priority that in-service programing must have.

No matter how swiftly, deftly and wisely a series of television programs might be prepared for in-service training, there would be a minimum time lapse of two years before such programing would be ready for teachers to view. Even if they all participated in the series in one year (and such a thing would not happen), three years would have elapsed before students were gaining the benefit of new instruction.

Perhaps the priority on programing in the Language Arts should be preparing three short but superior series — one for intermediate age children, one for junior high school students and one for senior high school students. A central theme for each might be the history, structure and philosophy of language. The power of television could bring examples of language from all over the world to illustrate the changes which have occurred in the language, discuss the reasons for change and relate the social pressures on language throughout history to the current uses of language and continual pressures on it. A companion theme would certainly be the analysis of communication as related to behavior. Such a series, carefully prepared, could inject some much-needed humor into the study of language. It could review the development of written and spoken language and certainly humor could pervade the consideration of the necessity for structure in the language.

If the series were prepared to provide new and exciting teaching techniques as well as a variety of supplementary materials like filmstrips or loops, records, tapes or printed materials, both students and teachers would be exposed to modern instruction based upon current research in the Language Arts. Students would enjoy immediate benefit from their participation and teachers would have an opportunity to observe their students' reactions to the new material as well as to acquire skill in handling new material themselves.

At the end of the "think" session, the panel members reviewed their reactions to the conference. There was unanimous agreement that the experience was entirely worthwhile and stimulating in spite of disheartening moments. There was unanimous agreement that television as a tool of instruction is here to stay and that the uses of television for instruction have been scratched ever so lightly.

The panel decided that Language Arts programs should be short; series should be short; on-camera teachers are not necessary; the content of the series should be based upon research, relevance to the student's needs and surroundings and upon carefully designed behavioral objectives; and new programing *must* be field-tested before it is released. Pilot projects and mini-programs should be explored as a means of testing the techniques of instruction and the relevance of content *prior* to completing a series of programs on the Language Arts. The specialists were enthusiastic about television's role and urgent that the development of new materials begin "as quickly as wisdom will permit."

Part II — The Status of Television in Language Arts Education

The material in this report is based upon replies to questionnaires sent to more than 130 educational television stations, public school systems, state departments of education, and state and regional educational television agencies. In addition, 342 closed-circuit television facilities below the college level were surveyed.

N.I.T. found 124 telecourses in use in elementary, secondary and in-service Language Arts education. No attempt was made to locate Language Arts telecourses at the higher education level.

PRIMARY GRADES

GRADE EMPHASIS Forty-three percent of all telecourses was designed for use at the primary level (K through 3). Thirteen of the 53 courses were designed for reading instruction, two for writing instruction, nine for listening activities, 12 for speaking, and 17 for two or more concerns of Language Arts education.

FREQUENCY OF TRANSMISSION As shown on the chart on page 9, the great majority of telecourses at this level were transmitted at the rate of one lesson each week. There were two courses transmitted twice weekly; two three times each week; and seven at other less frequent rates. A rate of transmission was not specified for four courses.

RECORDED OR UNRECORDED Of these 53 courses, only one was not recorded for later use. One other was recorded at irregular intervals.

INTERMEDIATE GRADES

GRADE EMPHASIS Thirty-one percent of all telecourses was designed for use in the intermediate grades (four through six). The largest number of telecourses (18) concerned read-

ing instruction. There were five for writing instruction, six for listening activities, one for speech instruction, and nine concerning two or more areas.

FREQUENCY OF TRANSMISSION Twenty-eight of the 39 telecourses were transmitted at the rate of one lesson each week. Four were transmitted twice weekly, one three times each week, and five at other less frequent rates. A rate of transmission was not specified for one course.

RECORDED OR UNRECORDED All but four of the telecourses were recorded for later use. One of these four was recorded at irregular intervals.

SECONDARY GRADES

GRADE EMPHASIS Of the 124 courses, 19 percent was designed for use in secondary grades (7 through 12). The majority of these (11) was for reading instruction. One course was designed for writing instruction, three for listening activities, and eight were for two or more of these areas. No courses were designed specifically for listening activities.

FREQUENCY OF TRANSMISSION Twelve courses were transmitted at the rate of one lesson each week. Two were transmitted twice weekly, one at a rate of three each week, and four daily. Three courses had other less frequent rates of transmission. No transmission rate was specified for one course.

RECORDED OR UNRECORDED The greatest number (7) of unrecorded courses was found at the secondary level. Five of these however, were recorded at irregular intervals.

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

Nine series were considered for in-service Language Arts education. Only two were designed for one specific area, reading. Six of the series were transmitted once each week. All the in-service education courses were recorded for later use.

LESSON TRANSMISSION RATE

	1/wk	2/wk	3/wk	4/wk	5/wk	other	not stated
Primary	38	2	2	0	0	7	4
Intermediate	28	4	1	0	0	5	1
Secondary	12	2	1	0	4	3	1
In-Service	6	1	1	0	0	1	0
Totals	84 (68%)	9 (7%)	5 (4%)	0	4 (3%)	16 (13%)	6 (5%)

Part III — Television in Language Arts Education

TELECOURSE TITLE	PRODUCER	GRADE LEVEL	NO. OF LESSONS	LESSON LENGTH	FREQ. OF BRDCST.
	PRIMARY				
ABOUT BOOKS	KDPS, Iowa	2	8	15′	1/mo
ADVENTURES IN READING	Minneapolis Public Schs.	3	11	15′	1/wk
ADVENTURES IN THE ARTS	WITF, Pennsylvania	K-6	16	60′	1/wk
ADVENTURES WITH SOUND: PHONICS	WNED-TV, New York	2	28	20′	1/wk
CHILDREN'S LITERATURE	Nebraska Council for ETV	1-3	30	15′	1/wk
COME ALONG LISTENERS	MOEBA & KYNE, Nebraska	K	32	15′	1/wk
COME AND SEE	Brooklyn Diocesan TV System, New York	1-2	8	15′	2/mo
EXPLORING LITERATURE	MOEBA, Nebraska	3	31	15′	1/wk
FUN TALK	Granite School District Salt Lake City, Utah	K-1	14	20′	alt. wk.
FUN WITH SOUND: PHONICS	WNED-TV, New York	1	28	20′	1/wk
FUN WITH SPEECH	KDPS, Iowa	K	18	15′	1/wk
THE GOLDEN DOOR	WKNO, Tennessee	1-2	30	14′	1/wk

TELECOURSE TITLE	PRODUCER	GRADE LEVEL	NO. OF LESSONS	LESSON LENGTH	FREQ. OF BRDCST.
	PRIMARY				
HAPPY TALK	KCSD, Missouri	1	32	15′	1/wk
HAPPY TALKING TIME	Salt Lake City Schools, Utah	1-2	9	15′	1/wk
HOW YOU TALK	WGTE, Ohio	1	16	15′	1/wk
I WANT TO WRITE	Los Angeles County Schools, California	1-3	5	20′	1/wk
IMAGINE THAT . . .	21" Classroom & WGBH, Massachusetts	1	15	15′	1/wk
INITIAL TEACHING ALPHABET	KETC, Missouri	K-1	16	20′	3/wk
KULTUR KALEIDESCOPE	UNIT, KUED, Utah	K-3	28	20′	—
LANGUAGE	KDPS, Iowa	1	4	15′	1/wk
LANGUAGE ARTS	KDPS, Iowa	3	18	15′	2/mo
LANGUAGE ARTS	KTCA, Minnesota	2	6	15′	—
LANGUAGE ARTS	KTCA, Minnesota	3	11	15′	1/wk
LANGUAGE CORNER	WCVE-TV, Virginia	1	30	15′	1/wk
NGUAGE LANE	WCVE-TV, Virginia	3	31	20′	1/wk
LET'S LISTEN	KCSD, Missouri	K	30	15′	—
LISTEN AND SAY	MPATI, Indiana	1-2	32	15′	1/wk
LISTENING WITH LESTER	Salt Lake City Schools, Utah	K	10	15′	1/wk
THE MAGIC BOOKSHELF	WSJK, Tennessee	1	31	15′	1/wk
MAGIC OF WORDS	WETA, Washington, D.C.	1-3	28	15′	1/wk
MOTIVATION FOR READING	Elmira City School District, New York	1	30	12′-18′	1/wk
ONE-TWO-THREE	KETC, Missouri	1-3	32	15′	1/wk
PRIMARY SPECIALS	Brooklyn Diocesan TV System, New York	1-3	29	15′-20′	1/wk
PRIMARY SPEECH IMPROVEMENT	Birmingham Area ETV Association, Alabama	1-3	74	15′	2/wk
READING	Washington County Board of Education, Hagerstown, Maryland	1-3	108	22′	3/wk
THE ROAD TO READING	KETC, Missouri	1-3	32	15′	1/wk
SOUNDS LIKE MAGIC	MOEBA, Nebraska	1	30	15′	1/wk
SOUNDS TO SAY	21" Classroom & WGBH, Massachusetts	1-2	15	15′	1/wk
SPEECH IMPROVEMENT: GRADE 3	WNED-TV, New York	3	30	20′	1/wk
SPEECH TIME	KDPS, Iowa	1	17	15	1/wk
STORYLAND	KDPS, Iowa	1	9	15′	1/mo
STORYTIME	WGTE, Ohio	1	8	15′	—
STORYTIME I	Salt Lake School District, Utah	K-3	36	14′	1/wk
STORYTIME II	UNIT, KUED, Utah	K-3	28	15′	1/wk
TALKING TOWN	WQED, Pennsylvania	1-3	36	15′	1/wk
TELETOWN	WITF, Pennsylvania	3	23	15′	1/wk
TELL ME A STORY	WQED, Pennsylvania	K-3	30	15′	2/wk
WHAT'S YOUR IDEA?	KDPS, Iowa	2	16	15′	2/mo
WORD MAGIC	WCVE-TV, Virginia	2	16	15′	1/wk
WORKING WITH WORDS, I, II, III*	Birmingham Area ETV, Alabama	1-3	12	28:30	1/wk
YOU COME TOO	21" Classroom & WGBH, Massachusetts	3	15	15′	2/mo
	INTERMEDIATE				
ADVENTURES IN LANGUAGE	WNDT, New York	5-6	15	20′	1/wk
ADVENTURES IN LEARNING	Maine State Department of Education	5	6	15′	1/wk
ADVENTURES IN READING	Minneapolis Public Schools, Minnesota	4	2	15′	--
BILL MARTIN	KQED, California	3-5	30	15′	1/wk
BOOKS AND BEYOND	KDPS, Iowa	6	34	20′	1/wk
COME READ TO ME A POEM	WNYE, New York	4-8	31	20′	1/wk
COVER TO COVER	WETA, Washington, D.C.	5-6	30	20′	1/wk
ENGLISH COMPOSITION	KVIE, California	5	30	20′	1/wk
EXPLORING OUR LANGUAGE	WETA, Washington, D.C.	4-6	30	20′	1/wk
EXPLORING SENTENCES	SDA/ITVA, California	3-6	12	20′	1/wk
I LIKE TO LISTEN	KETC, Missouri	4-5	16	20′	1/wk
I WANT TO WRITE, GRADES 4-6	Los Angeles County Schools, California	4-6	5	20′	1/wk
IMPROVING DICTIONARY SKILLS	W. S. Guy Elementary School, Youngstown, Ohio	3-4	11	15′	2/wk
INVITATION TO READ	WGTE, Ohio	4	18	15′-20′	2/mo
INVITATION TO READ	WGTE, Ohio	5	18	15′-20′	2/mo
INVITATION TO READ	WGTE, Ohio	6	18	15′-20′	2/mo
IT'S A READING WORLD	WVIZ, Ohio	4-6	10	30′	1/wk
JOY IN READING	Birmingham Area ETV, Alabama	4-6	32	24′	1/wk
JUST BROWSING	KDPS, Iowa	5	35	20′	1/wk
LANGUAGE ARTS, 4-6, CREATIVE WRITING	Brooklyn Diocesan TV System, New York	4-6	8	15′	2/mo
LEARN TO SPELL	KETC, Missouri	3-4	32	20′	2/wk
LEARNING OUR LANGUAGE	MPATI, Indiana	3-4	64	20′	1/wk
LET'S IMAGINE	KCTS, Washington	1-6	33	15′	1/wk
LET'S TELL A STORY	Baltimore City Public Schools, Maryland	3-6	32	15′	1/wk
LIBRARIES AND LITERATURE	KLRN, Texas	3-6	30	15′	1/wk

TELECOURSE TITLE	PRODUCER	GRADE LEVEL	NO. OF LESSONS	LESSON LENGTH	FREQ. OF BRDCST.
	PRIMARY				
LIBRARY SKILLS	WMHT, New York	5-6	15	15′	1/wk
PEN IN HAND	Eugene Public Schools, Oregon	5-6	10	15′	1/wk
QUEST FOR THE BEST	Denver Public Schools, Colorado	4-6	32	20′	1/wk
READING	Washington County Board of Education, Hagerstown, Maryland	4-6	108	22′	3/wk
READING FOR PRE-TEENS	Columbus Public Schools & WOSU, Ohio	4-6	33	15′	1/wk
REMEDIAL READING, GRADE 4	WKNO, Tennessee	4	60	20′	2/wk
REMEDIAL READING, GRADE 5	WKNO, Tennessee	5	60	20′	2/wk
SHADOW TIME TALES	KCTS, Washington	1-6	17	15′	1/wk
SPEECH IMPROVEMENT, GRADE 4	WNED-TV, New York	4	28	20′	1/wk
SURVEYING LITERATURE	MOEBA & KYNE, Nebraska	5	32	15′	1/wk
TALES OF TREASURE	WMFE, Florida	4-8	34	20′	1/wk
TREASURES IN BOOKS	Baltimore City Public Schools, Maryland	3-6	16	15′	2/mo
WINGS FOR WORDS	WETA, Washington, D.C.	3-4	15	15′	1/wk
THE WORDSMITH	KQED, California	5-6	28	20′	1/wk
	SECONDARY				
AMERICAN LITERATURE: SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	WNED-TV, New York	10-12	25	20′	1/wk
APPROACHING POETRY	WNDT, New York	7-12	15	20′	1/wk
CROSSROADS, UNITS IV & V	KTCA, Minnesota	7-12	10	20′	1/wk
DRAMATICS – SPEECH INTERPRETATION	Salt Lake School District, Utah	7-12	8	29′	1/mo
ENGLISH COMPOSITION	Gulf Region ETV, Houston, Texas	7-9	15	30′	1/wk
ENGLISH EIGHT	Washington County Board of Education, Hagerstown, Maryland	8	180	22′	5/wk
ENGLISH LITERATURE	Forest Hills Schools, Grand Rapids, Michigan	11-12	30	20′-30′	2/mo
ENGLISH SEVEN	Washington County Board of Education, Hagerstown, Maryland	7	180	22′	5/wk
ENGLISH 12A	Washington County Board of Education, Hagerstown, Maryland	12	180	22′	5/wk
ENGLISH 12B	Washington County Board of Education, Hagerstown, Maryland	12	180	22′	5/wk
FROM FRANKLIN TO FROST	MPATI, Indiana	12	64	30′	2/wk
HUMANITIES	Council for TV Course in Humanities, Massachusetts	9-12	8	30′	1/mo
HUMANITIES	WMFE, Florida	Secondary	34	25′	1/wk
IMPROVE YOUR READING	Birmingham Area ETV, Alabama	7-12	64	28:30	2/wk
LANGUAGE ARTS	KTCA, Minnesota	9	5	30′	—
LET'S SPEAK ENGLISH	Salt Lake School District & KUED, Utah	7-12 adult	97	14′	3/wk
LITERATURE: GRADE 7	WNED-TV, New York	7	15	20′	1/wk
READING	East Junior High School, Braintree, Massachusetts	7	36	38′	1/wk
READING	East Junior High School, Braintree, Massachusetts	8	36	38′	1/wk
SECONDARY DEVELOPMENTAL READING I	WQED School Services, Pennsylvania	secondary	35	25′	1/wk
SECONDARY DEVELOPMENTAL READING II	WQED School Services, Pennsylvania	secondary	34	25′	1/wk
THE SHAPES AND SOUNDS OF POETRY	WCVW-TV, Virginia	10	15	25′	1/wk
VARIATIONS ON A LITERARY THEME	WEDH, Connecticut	9-12	13	15′	1/wk
	IN-SERVICE				
BEGINNERS IN READING INSTRUCTION	WNYE, New York	IN-S 1-2	14	30′	1/wk
CREATIVITY IN THE LANGUAGE ARTS	KYVE, Washington	IN-S	20	45′	2/wk
DO YOU READ ME?	KQED, California	IN-S	15	30′	1/wk
ENGLISH: FACT AND FANCY	WETA, Washington, D.C.	IN-S	15	30′	1/wk
ENGLISH FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHERS	Twin City Area ETV Corporation/KTCA, Minnesota	IN-S	45	30′	3/wk
LANGUAGE ARTS 1-6	Brooklyn Diocesan TV System, New York	IN-S	26	30′	1/wk
LANGUAGE ARTS – IN-SERVICE	Salt Lake School District, Utah	IN-S	4	29′	4/yr
LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGE LEARNING	KQED, California	IN-S	15	30′	1/wk
LIVING LANGUAGE	WETA, Washington, D.C.	IN-S	15	30′	1/wk

• 3 courses

N.I.T.
The National Instructional Television Center
Box A
Bloomington, Indiana 47401